

NOTE: I am a “critical annalist” or critical thinker. I seek to find cracks in the system. I seek to determine whether there might be a better way of doing things. Not all of my ideas fit into the mold set by society. That being clearly stated you read my material with an open mind, being a critical thinker yourself and discern whether an option presented may work for you or should be discarded. Most of my material is FACTUAL and can be applied at one instance or another; some material must not be used by unskilled hands.

CONNECT THE DOTS...

First, let’s look at the “structure” of a court document. You’ll see at the top WHO sent this document and WHO it is addressing (by what authority). The next portion gives a more specific detail of “by what authority”, which is referred to as Scilicet, or S.S. This “header” portion of every court case displays “Jurisdiction” and “Venue”. Jurisdiction falls under **Legislative Statutes** while Venue falls under **TERRITORIAL LAW**. Territorial Law might include Common Law, Commercial Contract, Private Contract, or even Admiralty Law.

Don’t think that Jurisdiction (title 4 **legislative** court) and Venue (territorial law court, title 3, **judicial**) are your only choices. Most prevalent is “**Common Law**” (U.C.C. 1-103.6). Pay special attention to an upcoming section referred to as “Scilicet”.

Take a “side step” at any EARLY time during opening of the case and state that you have an issue of **Fraud** that must be entered. At, or near the same time enter the statement of (RSMo 1939 § 3359) 408.010. “The silver coins of the United States are hereby declared a legal tender, at their par value, fixed by the laws of the United States, and shall be receivable in payment of all debts, public or private, hereafter contracted in the state of Missouri; provided, however, that no person shall have the right to pay, upon any one debt, dimes and half dimes to an amount exceeding ten dollars, or of twenty and twenty-five cent pieces exceeding twenty dollars.”

Then, I’d throw my first artillery round to their side: **“Your Honor, the supposed plaintiff has no standing. Since dollars of silver are not available at par in this State from any bank, supposed plaintiff could not possibly have paid their incorporation fees or annual business license fees with legal tender of this State, so plaintiff does not exist at law.** I demand dismissal with prejudice, and that the plaintiff and his criminal cohorts be escorted from the state forthwith by the Sheriff" **Plaintiff: "Your Honor, we'd like to withdraw the claim!"**

Every charge has to have a statement that proves that the court has jurisdiction. If the plaintiff is a corporation, they usually write, "plaintiff is a corporation licensed to do business in this State." The above is my rebuttal. I also drop this on the "lawful service of process" claim, which invalidates due process. It's a trick bag they can't get out of."

And, one more thing, when corporations are incorporated, they pay their incorporation fees with FIAT "MONEY". That is NOT REAL money, so those corporations DO NOT exist in the REAL world. That is, they don't exist under common/Public law; they ONLY

exist under CORPORATE Public Policy. Which is in CORPORATE Democracy, NOT in a de jure Republic.

So the ENTIRE corporate Democracy operates in COMMERCE, which is NOT in the real world. It's an ARTIFICIAL world subject to the Law Merchant (the UCC). It DOES NOT exist in the real world. It is a corporate MATRIX.

I've always thought it real stupid when people claimed that men CANNOT contract with corporations, but now I see that it's true. Well, under certain conditions. If a corporation was formed in a Republic, and paid its incorporation fees with REAL MONEY (silver and gold), then it WOULD exist in a Republic and COULD contract with men and women.

But if a corporation was formed in a Democracy where it paid those fees with PRETEND money FRNs, then it would NOT exist in a republic, and so it COULD NOT contract with real people, only with other artificial persons in a corporate Democracy, or others engaging in commerce. You see, a **“Bankrupt” business, (U.S.) can only deal with “debt” (fiat) money in commerce.**

Also, U.S. SUPREME COURT DECISION – “All codes, rules and regulations are for government authorities ONLY, not human/Creators in accordance with God’s Laws. All codes, rules and regulations are unconstitutional and lacking due process...” *Rodrigues v. Ray Donovan*, U.S. Department of Labor, 769 F.2d, 1344, 1348 (1985).

At this point we need to add clarity concerning the “header” portion of court documents.

SCILICET: The section concerning “jurisdiction and venue”, or S.S. (scilicet) explains that if you’re under “statutory” jurisdiction you are in a “Legislative” Court. If you have no Jurisdiction, then you are under “Venue”, Territorial Court. **PAY ATTENTION. If you are not “licensed” to do whatever you are doing, they have NO JURISDICTION over you.** Bear in mind that without jurisdiction there is **no** “Defendant”. You become a **“Claimant”** and place a cross-claim on every issue introduced. Read on.

Have you questioned, “what if I have no nexus with the state in form of license granted”, as per; ***“It is impossible to prove jurisdiction exists absent a substantial nexus with the state, such as voluntary subscription to license. All jurisdictional facts supporting claim that supposed jurisdiction exists must appear on the record of the court.”*** *Pipe Line v. Marathon*. 102 S. Ct. 3858 quoting *Crowell v Benson* 883 US 22.

And, without a license, you’re not a “Licensee”, as per; ***“Where a person is not at the time a licensee, neither the agency, nor any official has any jurisdiction of said person to consider or make any order. One ground as to want of jurisdiction was, accused was not a licensee and it was not claimed that he was.”*** *O’Neil v Dept Prof. & Vocations*_7 CA 2d 398; *Eiseman v Daugherty* 6 CA 783

And, what if you’re not employed for compensation as a “licensee” for the act so

accused, as per: "Agency, or party sitting for the agency, (which would be the magistrate of a municipal court) **has no authority to enforce as to any licensee unless he is acting for compensation.** Such an act is highly penal in nature, and should not be construed to include anything, which is not embraced within its terms. (Where) there is no charge within a complaint that the accused was employed for compensation to do the act complained of, or that the act constituted part of a contract." Schomig v. Kaiser, 189 Cal 596.

More about non-granted jurisdiction as that of a "licensee", as per: "An action by Department of Motor Vehicles, whether directly or through a court sitting administratively as the hearing officer, must be clearly defined in the statute before it has subject matter jurisdiction, without such jurisdiction of the licensee, all acts of the agency, by its employees, agents, hearing officers, are null and void." Doolan v. Carr, 125 US 618; City v Pearson, 181 Cal. 640.

And, failure to reveal material facts is grounds for estoppel. "**Failure to reveal the material facts of a license or any agreement is immediate grounds for estoppel.**" Lo Bue v. Porazzo, 48 Cal.App.2d 82, 119, p.2d 346, 348.

The **Federal Tax Lien Act of 1966**, Pub. Law 89-719, Section 101, 80 Stat. 1125 (1966), which was adopted in order to conform the lien provisions of the internal revenue laws to the concepts developed in the Uniform Commercial Code says, "**The entire taxing and monetary systems are, hereby, placed under the U.C.C.**" The Federal Tax Lien Act of 1966, also see: Legis. Hist., pg 3722, C.R.S. 5-1-106.

The U.C.C. (Uniform Commercial Code), the "rule-book" for **all** transactions, is **owned** by UNIDROIT located in Rome, Italy (close to the "Holy See") and the U.S. government pays UNIDROIT \$260,000 per year for the use of their copyrighted material. Every piece of legalese that moves in, by, or through the United States is in conjunction with U.C.C.

Now, allow me to "shock your conscience" a little; not one in a thousand Americans can tell me where the "United States" is located. **NO YOU CAN'T.** U.C.C. § 9-307 (h) [Location of United States.] **The United States is located in the District of Columbia.** Look it up, please. Just look for "U.C.C. § 9-307 (h)".

Do you answer to being a United States Citizen? Of course, we all do. **ENTRAPMENT.** You must know that: "A "U.S. Citizen" **upon leaving the District of Columbia becomes involved in "interstate commerce", as a "resident" [and] does not have the common-law right to travel,** of a Citizen of one of the several states." Hendrick v. Maryland S.C. Reporter's Rd. 610-625. (1914)

Now, onto other government encroachments on American Citizens.

More on being a U.S. Citizen:

a. "I.R.C. Section 7701(39) IF ANY CITIZEN OR RESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES DOES NOT RESIDE IN (AND IS NOT FOUND IN) ANY UNITED STATES JUDICIAL DISTRICT, SUCH CITIZEN OR RESIDENT SHALL BE TREATED AS RESIDING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR PURPOSES OF ANY PROVISIONS OF THIS TITLE TO “ (A) jurisdiction of courts, or (B) enforcement of summons."

b. Also see Internal Revenue Code Section 7408(C) and Art. 1, Section 8, Clause 17 Constitution for the United States of America as defined and reinstated in National Mutual Insurance Company of the District of Columbia v. Tidewater Transfer Company, 337 U.S. 582, 93 L.Ed. 1556 (1948):

c. Which further states that **citizens of the District of Columbia are not embraced by the judicial power under Article 3** of the Constitution for the United States of America, the same statement is held in Hepburn v. Dundas v. Elizy, 2 Cranch (U.S.) 445, 2 L.Ed. 332.; In 1804, the Supreme Court, through Chief Justice Marshall, held that **a citizen of the District of Columbia was not a citizen of a state**; Chief Justice Marshall said:

“We hold that the District of Columbia is not a state within Article 3 of the Constitution. In other words cases between citizens of the District and those of the states were not included of the catalogue of controversies over which the Congress could give jurisdiction to the federal courts by virtue of Article 3. In other words Congress has exclusive legislative jurisdiction over citizens of Washington District of Columbia and through their plenary power nationally covers those citizens even when in one of the several states as though the district expands for the purpose of regulating its citizens wherever they go throughout the states in union".

WARNING: Chew the next one up real good before you attempt to swallow it!

“The **right of trial by jury** in civil cases, guaranteed by the 7th Amendment (Walker v. Sauvinet, 92 U.S. 90, 23 L. ed. 678), and **the right to bear arms, guaranteed by the 2d Amendment** (Presser v. Illinois, 116 U.S. 252, 29 L. ed. 615, 6 Sup. Ct. Rep. 580), have been distinctly held **not to be privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States**, ...” -- Twining v. New Jersey, 211 U.S. 78, 98 (1908)

So, somebody has stepped WAY over the line, but how did they do it? You gave them a license to do it!

Remember, “*Under International Law of Warfare, all parties to a cause must appear by **nom de guerre**, because an "alien enemy cannot maintain an action during the war in his own name*". Merriam-Webster, pg. 1534. [People, the all CAPS name is *nom de guerre*.]

And, the Oxford English Dictionary, 2nd ed., Clarendon Press (1989). *It is by International Doctrine that **the use of nom de guerre** would indicate a state of war.*

It is with the enforcement of obedience (military jurisdiction) by *vi et armis* (force of arms) that we can know the Government, Public Law, **Public Servants are waging war against the Private Citizen and the People**. [If you're writing tickets, fines, fees, receipts, etc., you're waging economic war on your mother, father, and kindred.]

According to Digest of International Law, Volume 10, and pages 95-127, "The Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Treasury, **in disregard to the administrative orders of the President**, conduct an "Alien Enemy Program" whose sole purpose is to unconstitutionally seize the properties of all Private Citizens, militarily, with the aid of such maritime hypothecations..."

Volume 20: Corpus Juris Sec. Section 1785: "*The United States Government is a foreign corporation with respect to a state*" NY re: Merriam 36 N.E. 505 141 S.Ct.1973, 41 L.Ed.287

Now, do you recall that I stated above that you gave them a "license" by way of your "name?" Bouvier's Law Dictionary, 8th ed., pg. 2287 "***The omission of the Christian name by either plaintiff or defendant in a legal process prevents the court from acquiring jurisdiction, ...***" Your "Christian name" is **not** in all UPPER CASE letters.

The next point to consider is that the "gubm't" is nothing more than a private corporation: "As the use of private corporate commercial paper, debt currency or securities is concerned, **removes the sovereignty status of the government** of "We the People" and reduces it to an entity rather than a government in the area of finance and commerce as a corporation or person. Governments descend to the level of a mere private corporation and take on the characteristics of a mere private citizen. This entity **cannot compel performance** upon its corporate statute or rules unless it, like any other corporation or person is the holder-in-due course of some contract or commercial agreement between it and the one upon whom the payment and performance are made and are willing to produce said documents and place the same evidence **before trying to enforce its demands called statutes**". For purposes of suit, such corporations and individuals are regarded as entities entirely separate from government." *Clearfield Trust Co. v. United States* 318 US. 363-371. Read it and weep.

Under the Clearfield Doctrine, the courts are no longer government entities in that they are demanding private monies and must have a contract with you to compel performance. **They are no more special as a normal business than your local Jack In The Box.**

Did the court demand payment in a certain "species"? **[U.S. \$]** Did the court make **payment** [on the record, or by way of agreement] of any entry fees? If one USD is given, or demanded, **[species]** HJR 192 is over-ridden and all Instruments have become "bogus financial instruments" involving private creditors and all "enjoined in the fraud" may be prosecuted under a variety of statutes; conspiracy (18 U.S.C. Sec 371); mail fraud (18 U.S.C. Sec 1341); **uttering** a false security (18 U.S.C. Sec 472); bank fraud (18 U.S.C. Sec 1344); and possessing and **uttering** a counterfeit security (18 U.S.C. Sec 513). SEE, *United States v. Uullman*, 187 F.3d 816 (8th Cir. 1999); *United States v. Hanzlicek*, 187 F.3d 1228, 1230 (10th Cir. 1999); *United States v. Wells*, 163 F.3d 889 (4th Cir. 1998); *United States v. Stockheimer*, 157 F.3d 1082 (7th Cir. 1998).

The **United States** may be deemed a corporation, *United States v. Hillegas*, 3 Wash. 73 (1811); **so may a State**, 1 Abb. U.S. 22 and 35 Ga. 315; and so, **a county**. *United States*

under Title 28, Section 3002 (15)(A)."United States means - (A) a Federal corporation."

As per the Supreme Court in *Murdock v. Pennsylvania* 319 US 105, "**A state may not, through a license tax, impose a charge for the enjoyment of a right granted by the Federal Constitution.**"

And, who is required to "pay" for use of public highways, as per: "***The tax is placed upon those obtaining compensation for the use of the public highways.***"
–In re Bush, 6 Cal.2d 43 [Crim. No. 3945. In Bank. April 1, 1936.] In the Matter of the Application of C.E.BUSH for a Writ of Habeas Corpus.

Let's take this a couple steps further: as per; 18 USC 31, (6) *Motor vehicle.*— *The term "motor vehicle" means every description of carriage or other contrivance propelled or drawn by mechanical power and used for commercial purposes on the highways in the transportation of passengers, passengers and property, or property or cargo.*

And, as per; 18 USC 31, (10) *Used for commercial purposes.*--- *The term "used for commercial purposes" means the carriage of persons or property for any fare, fee, rate, charge, or other consideration, or directly or indirectly in connection with any business, or other undertaking intended for profit.*

Fear, Intimidation, Coercion and simple Piracy rule over the lives of Americans. Well, you better be afraid and you better address them properly as "Sir" or "Ma'am" and you better kiss their ring regardless of which finger they wear it on. It is at present the way it has been for decades, "Justice to the highest bidder." They are the ones with shiny boots, fancy uniforms, guns, clubs, radios, and a swarm of dozens more just like themselves if needed. Resources? They have all the money they want; all they have to do is squeeze you a little more. So, continue to live on your knees or learn to stand like a man. [Womb men inclusive.]

There's a song that says, "If you're gonna be dumb, you gotta be tough." I agree with that; however, I'd like to say, "If you're gonna be successful, you gotta learn to pick your battles." It's stupid to argue with a cop (or, a court). My guestimate is 90% of cops are only overgrown 3rd grade bullies or want2be Hall Monitors. Choose your battles by conditioning the battlefield BEFORE you have to contend with them. Knowledge is the key to success, but only if it is properly applied. Here is the first step to activating your new knowledge:

The Fourth Amendment forbids stopping a vehicle even for limited purposes of questioning its occupants unless the police officer has a founded suspicion of criminal conduct. U.S. v. Ramirez & Sandoval, 872 F2d. 1392.

"The high Courts, through their citations of authority, have frequently declared, that "...where any state proceeds against a private individual in a judicial forum it is well

settled that the state, county, municipality, etc., waives any immunity to counters, cross claims and complaints, by direct or collateral means regarding the matters involved.” Luckenback v. The Thekla, 295 F 1020, 226 Us 328; Lyders v. Lund, 32 F2d 308;

“When enforcing mere statutes, judges of all courts do not act judicially (and thus are not protected by “qualified” or “limited immunity,” - SEE: Owen v. City, 445 U.S. 662; Bothke v. Terry, 713 F2d 1404) - - “but merely act as an extension as an agent for the involved agency -- but only in a “ministerial” and not a “discretionary capacity...”” Thompson v. Smith, 154 S.E. 579, 583; Keller v. P.E., 261 US 428; F.R.C. v. G.E., 281, U.S. 464.

DOT CONNECT: ORDER 1778 OF 1997

This connection simply exposes the fact that the Queen of England has authority over American Citizens to the extent that she can/has change(d) the rate of taxes on the United States and several other countries of Europe at the will of “Her Privy Council.”

DOT CONNECT: SIGNATURE ON BLANK PIECE OF PAPER

This connection shows why all authorities demand your “I.D.” upon contact at first instance. This is the first element of “Identity Theft” and runs rampant among every department of government management. Read my directive (found elsewhere) to see how they can access your Estate and rob you blind just by signing a piece of paper one time.

Your best (ONLY) defense is a good offense. Here’s where you find out what you are really made of. Do it, do it correctly, do it once, make your self impeccable and bulletproof.

We move ahead to the adaptation of Rule 65.1, which took effect on February 28, 1966, effectively dominant July 1, 1966, which coincides with the changes in Admiralty Law that took over the federal rules. Admiralty and Maritime Claims are any claim of debt involving “money” which require or permit the giving of security by a party in the form of a bond (promise) or stipulation (contract) or other undertaking, which automatically submits to the jurisdiction of the military (see next paragraph) court and (under such jurisdiction) irrevocably appoints the clerk of the court as surety’s agent (important) upon whom any papers affecting the surety’s liability on the bond or undertaking may be served. The surety’s liability may be enforced on motion* without the necessity of an independent action. The motion and such notice of the motion as the court prescribes may be served on the clerk of the court, who shall forthwith mail copies to the sureties if their addresses are known.

Here is the “process” I was talking about via your Claim with the (National) S.O.S. You place a “distress” on his/her (the Judge) bond, oath, or undertaking and, if judgment is against you, tell the Clerk of the Court to notify all contingent parties (with addresses) that there is an attachment of his/her properties against your claim for his breach. (Distress Attachment) 28 USC 1367

I have previously **accepted** his Oath of Office and I have **accepted** his proper assignment as Judge and/or Magistrate and I have **accepted** the Official Charter of The STATE OF (what ever STATE) held by Secretary Of State for the Federal Government as a firm and binding offer to contract along with any undertaking and stipulation he may make as **I am now bonding him** and effectively remove all liability away from him as an act of subrogation. **I JUST BECAME HIS SURETY.** That means, if he/she is discovered performing **under Color of Law** **executing damage to me**, I can **attach** everything **that is attached to his signature** and **the Clerk of the Court is going to do it for me.** **Your Bond Number is the number that is printed on the back of your Social Security Card. Your Bond is valued in your Labor, which equals Real Money – GOLD.** The payment for the Recording of your Bond should be in the form of coin (coin is still real money); and, have witnesses that you attempted to pay for such service with Silver Coin, but was rejected (they cannot deal with silver). Your “bond” for one hundred million dollars will cover 01 to 99 offending parties. When they discover that the Clerk will send the sheriff or federal marshal to confiscate and deliver their “toy” collections (like guns, boats, jewelry, etc.) to settle the account, well, they wake up. The “judge” need not be notified. The Clerk is the party bonded to do this, not the judge.

At this point I must leave this diatribe with instructions on **enforcement** to be found in my article titled, “HOW TO LEVEL THE PLAYING FIELD.” I suggest you prepare the battleground as instructed within that document. This is no time to timidly “whisper” your intentions. Stick out your chest and bellow it out like a raging bull that you demand to be let alone and anyone that sticks their hand into the fire **will get burned** – badly.

The below is attached to fortify your knowledge. Use it wisely.

Misc. Points

Point 1: **Pan American treaty of 12-26-1933** (49STAT3097) Treaty Series 881 - convention on Rights & Duties of the States - Congress took State statutes off and put the States under international law. **State statutes don't hold standing in international law.**

Point 2: **International Organization Immunities Act of 12-9-1945** - - Congress relinquished every public office over to the UN. Local governments up to the president fall under UN jurisdiction. Congress gave the UN the right to dictate what laws will be international & gave them the right to tax the States.

Point 3: **International Reorganization Rescind Act-** Congress put this into form but they never took action to rescind the act. Fairly recently an Ohio judge filed suit claiming that Congress did not have the right to relinquish government authority over to the UN (a corporation or foreign country) and that the Congressional act was a constitutional violation because they didn't put it to the States or the people to agree on it. In 2005 the US Supreme court declined to hear the case therefore **all public offices are under UN jurisdiction & they are NOT American Citizens.**

Point 4: **Oath of Office** - Title 5 USC 331, 332, 333 backed up by Title 22 CFR Foreign Relations 92.12 - 92.31 and Title 8 USC, section 1481 - the public official relinquishes his national citizenship and are thus foreign agents as stipulated under Title 22 USC, chapter 11, section 611, loss of national citizenship -- **Public officials are no longer US Citizens, but rather are foreign agents and must register as such.**

Point 5. U.S.C.A. § 951. Agents of foreign governments (who are these “agents?”)

(a) (3) any officially and publicly acknowledged and sponsored member of the staff of, or employee of, an officer, official, or representative described in paragraph (1) or (2), who is **not a United States citizen**; (See Points 1, 2, & 3 above)

Point 6. What about all the “liars” – ummm Lawyers operating in the U.S.?

The general consensus say that because B.A.R. stands for **British Accreditation Regency** it means that all lawyers, even in the US, pledge allegiance to Britain and are under the rule of the Queen.

Point 6: Article III, section 1, clause 1, "The judicial Power shall extend **to all Cases**, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority;--to all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls;--to all Cases of admiralty and maritime Jurisdiction;--to Controversies to which the United States shall be a Party;--to Controversies between two or more States;--between a State and Citizens of another State;--between Citizens of different States;--between Citizens of the same State claiming Lands under Grants of different States, and between a State, or the Citizens thereof, and foreign States, Citizens or Subjects."

The **11th Amendment** was an amendment to Article III of the Constitution for the united States of America, which stripped the courts of any judicial power by stating, **"The Judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of any Foreign State."**

This explains why I say that all “officials” are Agents of a Foreign State.

Since it (the 11th Amendment) was ratified after the Judicial Act of 1787 which created all the inferior courts and the attorney generals office (see US Attorney's manual 3-2.110), it applies to the States. Georgia ratified the 11th Amendment on 11/29/1794 and ratification was completed on 2-7-1795.

There are no **Judicial** courts in America and there have not been since 1789. Judges do not enforce Statutes and Codes. Executive Administrators enforce Statutes and Codes. (FRC v. GE 281 US 464, Keller v. PE 261 US 428, 1 Stat. 138-178).

(i) And, do the “courts” enforce laws, or codes? Answer: **Code is supreme.**

“Where both the code and general principles are available, the former should always be considered and applied if applicable. By legislative declaration the code is the law, and if general principles appear inconsistent, they must be considered displaced under AS 45.05.006. Moreover, even where inconsistency does not exist, the code must be regarded as supreme; general principles even when consistent with the code are merely supplementary“. Prince v. LeVan, 486 P.2d 959, 9 UCC Rep.Serv. 367 (1971). Kelly v. Miller, 575 P.2d 1221, 23 UCC Rep.Serv. 632 (1978)

(ii) But, are “judicial” courts necessary? Answer: The particular need for making the judiciary independent was elaborately pointed out by Alexander Hamilton in the Federalist, No. 78, from which we excerpt the following:

"The **Executive** not only dispenses the honors, but holds the sword of the community. The **Legislature** not only commands the purse, but prescribes the rules by which the duties and rights of every citizen are to be regulated. The **Judiciary**, on the contrary, has no influence over either the sword or the purse; no direction either of the strength or of the wealth of the society; and can take no active resolution whatever. It may truly be said to have neither force nor will, but merely judgment." WE HAVE NOT HAD THIS BALANCE OF POWER FOR A VERY LONG TIME!!

(iii) The “ideal” of checks and balances within government structure has long been a thing of the past.

The Reconstruction Acts took away the Lawful Standing, the Lawful Capacity, from the Citizens and changed their Lawful Standing to “Legal Status”, from ELECTORS in a THREE BRANCH GOVERNMENT as they were in Original Jurisdiction, to **REGISTERED VOTERS in a TWO BRANCH GOVERNMENT.**

Want proof? Go to your local City Clerk and ask for a CERTIFIED COPY of your City Charter in any State, or your local County Clerk for a CERTIFIED COPY of your County Charter in any State. You will discover that ALL cities and counties in your State have only two branches, the Executive and Legislative. **There is no Judicial Branch!!** **The Judicial Districts were all abolished in 1856 by the Act of the 34th Congress.**

The U.S. Supreme Court in 1860, reviewing the Act of the 34th Congress, ordered ALL the States in existence at that time to close down all the Court’s of law and all courts complied in 1860. None of the Court’s of any State are created by the Constitution of their State.

Every Court, from top to bottom, the justice of the peace courts, the police courts, the municipal courts, the district courts and the circuit courts are ALL Statutory Courts created by Statutes which were enacted by the **Legislature** and in fact, and law, merely Administrative Agencies and only have the authority conferred by

Statute.

z. There have not been any **Judges** in America since 1789. There have just been Administrators. (FRC v. GE 281 US 464, Keller v. PE 261 US 428 1Stat. 138-178).

(i) Modes of enforcement are erratic and arbitrary, a ground for prosecution is anybody's guess, and the operation in the law is shrouded in mystery. In most any issue at hand we might suggest the following:

"This ordinance is void for vagueness, both in the sense that it *"fails to give a person of ordinary intelligence fair notice that his contemplated conduct is forbidden by the statute,"* United States v. Harriss, 347 U.S. 612, 617, *and because it encourages arbitrary and erratic arrests and convictions.* Thornhill v. Alabama, 310 U.S. 88; Herndon v. Lowry, 301 U.S. 242."

When this court found that the Internal Revenue agents had violated the law and that the improperly seized records were to be returned, the agents were, to say the least, not happy. More than once have judges of a court been indirectly reminded that they too are taxpayers.

No sophisticated person is unaware that even in this commonwealth the Internal Revenue Service has been in possession of facts with respect to public officials which it has presented or shelved in order to serve what can only be called political ends, be they high or low. And a judge who knows the score is aware that every time his decisions offend the Internal Revenue Service, he is inviting a close inspection of his returns.? Lord v. Kelley, 240 F.Supp. 167 (1965).

(ii) Dear Friends: this all leads to domestic terrorism! Please follow:

18 USC 2331. - Definitions. As used in this chapter -

(5) the term "domestic terrorism" means activities that -

(A) involve acts dangerous to human life that are a violation of the criminal laws of the United States or of any State;

(B) appear to be intended -

(i) to intimidate or coerce a civilian population.

How to "escape" from a very bad situation.

[Under the law, it matters not where you are domiciled; nor, does it matter that you are NOT a U.S. citizen. What matters is that you "applied" for (an application form) **a benefit from a trust organization**. Such trust organization is dominant anywhere in the world where it can freely be associated. The various "States" (Guam, American Samoa, Virgin Islands, etc.) are Freely Associated States; contrary to, and **NOT** the same as the Freely Associated Compact States, which are the 48 Republic states, plus Alaska and Hawaii.

Now, to finish the thought concerning domicile; it matters not where you are domiciled; it only matters **where the trust is domiciled** that you made application to. You are free to “contract” with anyone anywhere in the world; however, the law of the trust domicile **you applied to** is the law that governs the transaction. I believe the I.R.S. is “trusted” in Puerto Rico; and, the Social Security Administration is “trusted” in the **British** Virgin Islands (now, do you see how the Queen can raise the S.S.A. taxes on Americans?). When the Holy Writ tells us to “come out of Her, My people,” it’s a very easy thing to do. All we have to do is rescind our “applications.”]